



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,423	12/28/2001	Jun Ibuki	1619.1016	4360
21171	7590	04/14/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			FERNANDES, CHERYL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,423	IBUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheryl M Fernandes	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 and 45-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 and 45-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 November 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413). |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 16 November 2004.

Claims 1-22 and 45-67 are presented for examination. Claims 23-44 have been cancelled. Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-22, and 45-67 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Referring to the objection to the drawings, Applicant's amendments have been acknowledged. Consequently, the objection to the drawings has been withdrawn.

3. Referring to the objection to the specification, Applicant's amendments have been acknowledged. Consequently, the objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

4. Referring to the objections to claims 4 and 6, Applicant's amendments have been acknowledged. Consequently, the objections to the claims have been withdrawn.

5. Referring to the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections directed to claims 1-22 and 45-67, Applicant's arguments have been acknowledged. Consequently, the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections directed to the claims have been withdrawn.

6. Referring to the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections directed to claims 1, 45, and 67, Applicant's arguments have been acknowledged. Consequently, the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections directed to the claims have been withdrawn.

7. Referring to the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections directed to claims 18 and 62, Applicant's amendments to the claims have been acknowledged. Consequently, the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections directed to the claims have been withdrawn.

8. Referring to the 35 USC 112 second paragraph lack of antecedent basis rejections directed to claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 16, 20, 45, 47, 48, 52, 60, and 64-67, Applicant's amendments to the claims have been acknowledged. Consequently, the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections directed to the claims have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 16 November 2004, with respect to claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 12-22, 45, 46, 50-52, 54, and 56-67, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

9. Referring to claims 1, 45, and 67, Applicant argues that Anwar does not disclose analyzing an intention of a query based on a result of the analysis of said search request, formatting an output by selecting items to be presented to the user, determining an output format of search results according to a result of said analysis of

the intention of said query, and presenting data to said user. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner respectfully asserts that the keyword refinement analysis (para. 48) based on the determined keywords from the query analysis (para. 9) is clearly analyzing an intention of a query based on a result of the analysis of said search request.

Examiner asserts that user selection of a given result by clicking on the result selector in order to display a result page with the selected results (Fig. 4, element 408; para. 73) is formatting an output by selecting items to be presented to the user.

Examiner asserts that a user can determine a display format of query results (Fig. 4, para. 73). In addition, the determination of results of a query-by-question path displayed in cross-tabulated and graphical formats (para. 48, Fig. 7B) based on the keyword refinement analysis (para. 9 and 48) is determining an output format of search results according to a result of said analysis of the intention of said query.

Examiner asserts that the displaying of query-by-question path results in cross-tabulated and graphical formats (para. 48, Fig. 7B) is presenting data to said user.

10. Referring to claims 2 and 46, Applicant argues that Anwar does not disclose a core topic. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Anwar clearly discloses determination of a core topic of a search request in refining query results wherein a keyword 'drink' is determined as a core topic that causes it to be refined into a keyword 'coke' (para. 48).

11. Referring to claims 6 and 50, Applicant argues that Anwar does not disclose using data specifying an item relating to a particular item to add the item relating to the particular item to the items to be presented, after the items to be presented to said user is determined. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Anwar teaches presenting generated query results, based on keywords related to a query element, and also teaches presenting refined suggested sub-queries to the user (para. 27).

12. Referring to claims 8 and 52, Applicant argues that Anwar does not disclose removing an item used as the search criteria from presentation items after the presentation items are determined and adding the value of said item to the presentation items as a description of said presentation items. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Anwar teaches removing the search criteria ‘Drink’ from the presentation items ‘drink keyword categories’ results (Fig. 7B, element 760), after the related keyword categories are determined (para. 48).

13. Referring to claims 7, 10, 12-22, 51, 54, and 56-66, Applicant argues that there is no reasonable expectation of success to combine elements of the aforenoted claims. However, Examiner submits that Applicant has not supported the arguments with any evidence showing that there was no reasonable expectation of success. Refer to MPEP § 2143.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 45-50, 52, 53, 55, and 67 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication Number 2001/0047355 A1 by Anwar.

Referring to claims 1, 45, and 67, Anwar discloses:

A query-and-response processing method, system, and computer program ('query information retrieval content enhancing system and method', Abstract, Field of Invention, Summary, 'search engine program, para. 77 (Fig. 5B, element 554)) for receiving a search request concerning a query input by a user ('user posed query (Boolean or natural language)', para. 4) and searching a database ('polling' of database, para. 9; QIRCES contains a query/results database, para. 11, 28; para. 43) to present search results to the user (para. 9, lines 6-8; para. 43), comprising:

- analyzing said search request (Search Engine Interface (SEI), para. 46¹) provided by said user ('analyzing user query', para. 3, 9);
- generating search criteria (application server determines type of query, para. 69) based on a result of the analysis of said search request (user query is captured by an application server(Fig. 3, element 302), para. 68; DMR operate on query terms to generate a request, para. 70);
- searching said database ('input query into a database', para. 12) according to the generated search criteria (MWI (Middleware Interface) sends DB (database) requests to a database that returns results, para. 70-71; Fig. 3);
- analyzing an intention of the query (para. 9, lines 1-3; 'extracting query elements', para. 12, 'query element classification protocol', para. 14; para. 13) based on the result of the analysis of said search request ('keywords' and 'connectors' are extracted from queries depending on the determination of the type of language the query uses, para. 69; Fig. 3, element 317; keyword refinement, para. 48, lines 14-18);
- formatting an output by selecting items to be presented to the user (para. 14, lines 13-17; Fig. 4, element 408; para. 73) and determining an output format of search results (results presented in predetermined order, para. 14, lines 13-17; 'display format conditional step' (Fig. 4, element 402), para. 73) according to a result of said analysis of the intention of said query (para. 28, lines 5-9; para. 44, lines 15-16; para. 48, Fig. 7B); and

¹ The Search Engine Interface (SEI) allows users to pose queries or search requests in a variety of

- presenting data to said user ('display page format step' (Fig. 4, element 410), para. 73; Fig. 7A; para. 4, lines 9-11; 'presentation routine', para. 14, lines 13-17; para. 26; email interface, para 28 and 52; para. 48, Fig. 7B).

Referring to claims 2 and 46, Anwar discloses determining a topic item, said topic item being a core topic of the search request (see discussion of limitation 4 of claim 1 above; 'determining keyword coke from the keyword drink', para. 48); and selecting an item to be presented to said user based on the determination as to whether or not the item is the topic item (results relating to keywords and connectors are gathered, para. 69; also see discussion of limitation 5 of claim 1 above).

Referring to claims 3 and 47, Anwar discloses processing information by ordering the search results of presentation items (para. 28, lines 9-12 and 20-24; para. 44; 'Rank Results' button, Figure 7B, element 788, para. 85, lines 4-8).

Referring to claims 4 and 48, Anwar discloses adjusting a level of detail of the presentation to provide all specific items or only main items relating to a particular subject (see Abstract; para. 28, lines 1-9; para 44, lines 15-16; para 48).

Referring to claims 5 and 49, Anwar discloses classifying the search results according to specified item values to organize by category the information to be

presented to the user (results are tabulated into geographical, drink and years categories, para. 84, Fig. 7B, elements 758, 760, 762).

Referring to claims 6 and 50, Anwar discloses using data specifying an item relating to a particular item to add the item relating to the particular item to the items to be presented, after the items to be presented to said user are determined (para. 27²).

Referring to claims 8 and 52, Anwar discloses determining an item under which a value is specified as search criteria (para. 27, lines 1-15); and removing an item used as the search criteria from presentation items after the presentation items are determined and adding the value of said item to the presentation items as the description of said presentation items (see 'Drink' description title under which 'alcoholic', 'beverages', and 'dairy' categories fall in search results in Fig. 7B; para. 48; Refer to Fig. 6A for depiction of 'drink' as a search criteria in window 662).

Referring to claims 9 and 53, Anwar discloses an item under which a value is specified and for which no search data is included in the search results is excluded from presentation items during the selection of the presentation items (see Fig. 7B for 'US' item value mentioned in table of results (element 758) but excluded from graphical representation of search results, in element 764).

Referring to claims 11 and 55, Anwar discloses:

providing an item database containing all the values in a particular item that are held in a database to be searched (see Background, para. 7, lines 1-10; 'polling database for related keywords', para. 9; para. 14, lines 1-7; 'query/results database', para. 28, lines 1-20); and,

if no entry in said item database matches a specified value in the item in the search request, searching for entries having values similar to the specified value (see Abstract, lines 1-7; para. 13; 'related query element routine', para. 14) and presenting said similar values to the user as alternative value candidates from which the user can make a selection (Abstract, lines 7-12; 'suggested questions' are output, para. 10, lines 5-10; para 13; 'presentation routine', para. 14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

² After the system extracts elements from the query and determines related keywords, it presents the related results as an active list or on a page-by-page basis.

15. Claims 7 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, and further in view of US Patent Number 6,401,084 B1 issued to Ortega et al. (hereafter Ortega).

Referring to claims 7 and 51, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject matter as disclosed above, but fails to teach storing information about correspondence between a word used for specifying search criteria in an item in the database and an item name in the database as well as replacing said item name in the database with said word to present said search results.

However, Ortega teaches storing information about correspondence between a word used for specifying search criteria in an item in a database and an item name in the database ('correlation table' contains a 'related terms list', col. 6, lines 14-20; col. 7, lines 10-24). Ortega also teaches replacing the item name in the database with a word to present search results (see Abstract; Summary (col. 1 line 65- col. 2, line 34); col. 7, lines 17-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include storing information about correspondence between a word used for specifying search criteria in an item in a database and an item name in the database as well as replacing the item name in the database with a word to present search results, as taught by Ortega.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of increasing the likelihood that the query result will contain items that are of interest to the user as the replacement terms found by the searching method

are more likely to be the terms that were intended by the user. In addition, the method is well suited for correcting terms that do not appear in a dictionary, such as proper names and product names (Ortega, col. 2, lines 34-47).

16. Claims 10, 13, 16, 54, 57, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, in view of US Patent Number 5,907,837 issued to Ferrel et al (hereafter Ferrel).

Referring to claims 10 and 54, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject matter as disclosed above, and also teaches providing an item database containing all the values in a particular item that are held in a database to be searched (para. 43).

Anwar fails to teach providing an alert to the user for indicating a search failure and the cause thereof before executing the entire search process.

However Ferrel teaches analogous art wherein a user is provided with an alert for indicating a search failure and the cause thereof before executing the entire search process (col. 42, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include providing an alert to the user for indicating a search failure and the cause thereof before executing the entire search process, as taught by Ferrel.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of allowing the user to know what happened when no matches to their search are found (Ferrel, col. 42, lines 60-65).

Referring to claims 13 and 57, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject matter as disclosed above, and also teaches generating search criteria to be first used in the search execution step (refer to discussion of claim 1, limitations 2 and 3 above).

Anwar fails to teach determining whether the search succeeds or fails based on the results of the search performed, widening search criteria so as to increase the number of search sets if the search fails, and repeatedly widening the search criteria until the search succeeds or the search criteria becomes unable to be widened.

However Ferrel teaches analogous art wherein the determination as to whether a search succeeds or fails based on the results of the search performed, in particular, situations in which a search failed due to no results or a search was successful but too many search results were found (col. 42, line 60 – col. 43, line17).

Ferrel also teaches, widening search criteria so as to increase the number of search sets if the search fails by allowing a user to find more matches by clearing some of the query elements or values and submitting an edited search by pressing the 'Find Now' button (col. 42, lines 60-65; col. 43, lines 10-17).

In addition, Ferrel teaches repeatedly widening the search criteria until the search succeeds or the search criteria become unable to be widened wherein the user can continue to clear query elements and use the 'Find Now' button until a successful

match is found or be alerted when the search criteria become unable to be widened and thus returns a 'no articles like you described could be found' alert (col. 41, lines 57-65; col. 42, line 60- col. 43, line 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include determining whether the search succeeds or fails based on the results of the search performed, widening search criteria so as to increase the number of search sets if the search fails, and repeatedly widening the search criteria until the search succeeds or the search criteria become unable to be widened, as taught by Ferrel.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of allowing a user to define a search object to retrieve content matching desired criteria (Ferrel, col. 3, lines 61-62). In addition, the information retrieval server satisfies the need for fast and efficient search over a low-bandwidth communication path (Ferrel, col. 4, lines 20-25).

Referring to claims 16 and 60, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject matter as disclosed above and also teaches the determination as to whether or not an item extracted as a topic in the search request at said search request generation step corresponds to an item in the database to be searched (refer to discussion of limitation 4 of claim 1 above).

However, Anwar fails to teach an alert concerning the form of the search request if the analysis at said search request analysis step fails and an alert indicating that the query is outside the scope of the system if the analysis of the correspondence fails.

Ferrel teaches analogous art wherein an alert that is provided to a user if no results are shown at the end of a search, thereby indicating that a query is outside the scope of a system (refer to discussion of claim 10 above with regard to the provision of an alert that indicates search failure). Ferrel also teaches an alert that is provided concerning the form of a search request if the analysis at said search request analysis step fails, by suggesting to the user that the form of the query was not suitable and that the user should clear some of the values in the query in order to obtain better results (col. 42, lines 60-65). Examiner respectfully asserts that the alert provided for by Ferrel performs both duties addressed above. In addition, Ferrel also teaches another alert that indicates the form of a search request if the analysis fails by suggesting to the user that the form of a query was not suitable and that the user should add more values to the query to order to reduce the number of search results obtained (col. 43, lines 10-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include an alert concerning the form of the search request if the analysis at said search request analysis step fails and indicating that the query is outside the scope of the system if the analysis of the correspondence fails, as taught by Ferrel.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of allowing the user to know what happened when no matches to their search are found (Ferrel, col. 42, lines 60-65) or when too many matches are found (Ferrel, col. 43, lines 5-17).

17. Claims 12 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar as applied to claims 11 and 55 above, in view of US Patent Number 5,752,244 issued to Rose et al. (hereafter Rose), and further in view of US Publication Number 2002/0042784 A1 by Kerven et al. (hereafter Kerven).

Referring to claims 12 and 56, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject matter as disclosed above, and also teaches presenting an alternative to a specified value in an item to a user, and allowing the alternative to be accepted by the user (for presentation of alternatives, refer to discussion of claims 6, 28, and 50 above; for allowing alternatives to be accepted by user refer to para. 26, lines 10-14).

However, Anwar fails to teach, storing a pair of an originally specified value and an alternative as synonymous words for a value in an item to use the pair to automatically widen criteria during generation of search criteria.

Rose teaches analogous art including storing a pair of an originally specified value and an alternative as synonymous words for a value in an item. These stored pairs are keyword-category pairs that are stored in a keywords table as well as a session data object (col. 14, lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anwar with the teachings to Rose to include storing a pair of an originally specified value and an alternative as synonymous words for a value in an item

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar with the teachings of Rose for the purpose of storing of multimedia assets which in turn allows the reusing of existing assets when developing new multimedia applications (Rose , Background, lines 39-55) and for the purpose of using predetermined criteria to determine whether to allow checkout of a particular multimedia asset stored on a database (Rose, Abstract).

While Rose teaches storing pairs of synonymous words, Rose is silent as to the automatic widening of criteria during generation of search criteria.

However, Kerven teaches the automatic widening or expansion of criteria during generation of search criteria (Abstract; para. 25-26, 69-70, and 115).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anwar and Rose with the teachings to Kerven to include automatic widening or expansion of criteria during generation of search criteria for the purpose of allowing search engines that begin with a set of keywords provided by the user to generate links potentially relevant to the keywords provided thereby enabling a more defined search.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar and Rose with the teachings to Kerven per the above for the purpose enabling a search to

be more convenient as it generates links directly to relevant information rather than requiring navigation (Kerven, para 14, lines 1-6).

18. Claims 14 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar in view of Ferrel, as applied to claims 13 and 57 above, and further in view of Ortega.

Referring to claims 14 and 58, the combination of Anwar/Ferrel as set forth above discloses all of the claimed subject matter including the widening of search criteria but the aforesaid combination is silent as to the value specification for a particular item in the database being extended to the value specification for an event relating to the item.

However, Ortega teaches the extension or replacement of a value specification for an item with a value specification for a related event by replacing a non-matching term item in a search query with a replacement related term event as a substitute (refer to discussion of claim 7 above with respect to replacing an item name in a database; col. 2, line 58 - col. 3, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar/Ferrel to include extension or replacement of a value specification for an item with a value specification for a related event, as taught by Ortega.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar/Ferrel per the above for the purpose of increasing the likelihood that the query result will contain items that are of interest to the user as the replacement terms found by the searching method are more likely to be the terms that were intended by the user. In addition, the method is well suited for correcting terms that do not appear in a dictionary, such as proper names and product names (Ortega, col. 2, lines 34-47).

19. Claims 15 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar in view of Ferrel, as applied to claims 13 and 57 above, and further in view of US Publication Number 2001/0044758 A1 by Talib et al. (hereafter Talib).

Referring to claims 15 and 59, the combination of Anwar/Ferrel as set forth above discloses all of the claimed subject matter. While Anwar fails to disclose a database to be searched that is composed of structured text and structure tags with corresponding text, Ferrel discloses a database to be searched that is composed of structured text (col. 25, lines 46-48). In addition Ferrel also discloses structure tags with corresponding text (col. 22, lines 18-37).

However, Anwar/Ferrel fails to disclose that a structure tag is replaced with a tag covering a broader text range in a tag hierarchy to widen the search criteria.

Talib discloses a structure tag that is replaced with a tag covering a broader text range in a tag hierarchy to widen the search criteria (para. 95, Fig. 4). Talib discloses through the illustration of Fig. 4, that a user may drill-up through the search results

presented, and change the category to be searched from Women's Clothing to Price, while still maintaining the same search constraints.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar/Ferrel to include that a structure tag is replaced with a tag covering a broader text range in a tag hierarchy to widen the search criteria, as taught by Talib.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar/Ferrel per the above for the purpose of allowing a user to 'navigate' through a search using any category or taxonomy at any time. Additional motivation could be that users are able to view the transmitted and displayed categories in order to select from, rather than being provided with long lists of electronic record hits (Talib, Summary, para 35 and 36).

20. Claims 17 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar, as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, in view of Rose and further in view of Ferrel.

Referring to claims 17 and 61, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject as set forth above, but fails to disclose a list of keywords that is unique to each of various areas and is used to determine the area of the search request. In addition, Anwar fails to disclose an alert that is provided to the user for indicating that the query is outside the scope the system if it is determined that the area of the search request is not addressed by the system.

Rose teaches in analogous art, a list of keywords that is unique to each of various areas and is used to determine the area of a search request (col. 17, lines 36-39 and 46-50; col. 20, line 66- col. 21, line10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include a list of keywords that is unique to each of various areas and is used to determine the area of a search request, as taught by Rose.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of specifying a keyword-category combination to add a search component to a query (Rose, col. 21, lines 10-18).

However, while Rose discloses the above mentioned limitation, Rose is silent as to an alert that is provided to the user for indicating that a query is outside the scope a system if it is determined that the area of a search request is not addressed by the system.

Ferrel teaches in analogous art, an alert that is provided to the user for indicating that a query is outside the scope of a system if it is determined that the area of a search request is not addressed by the system (refer to discussion of claims 10 and 16 above).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar/Rose to include an alert that is provided to the user for indicating that a query is outside the scope of a system if it is determined that the area of a search request is not addressed by the system, as taught by Ferrel.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar/Rose per the above for the purpose of allowing the user to know what happened when no matches to their search are found (Ferrel, col. 42, lines 60-65) or when too many matches are found (Ferrel, col. 43, lines 5-17).

21. Claims 18 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar, as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, in view of Ortega.

Referring to claims 18 and 62, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject as set forth above, but fails to teach that search criteria for an item on a main item list provided in advance are generated for a topic in a search request for which no correspondence to an item in a database is found at said search criteria generation step to repeat the search in each of the main items and present the search results to a user.

However, Ortega teaches a 'related terms' list provided in advance that is generated for a topic in a search request for which no correspondence to an item in a database is found and repeats the search in each of the main items and presents the search results to a user (see Summary, col. 1, line 65- col. 2, line 33). Ortega teaches that the related terms list is used to compare related terms in the list to one or more non-matching terms in a query to find possible substitutes. The user can also be prompted to select possible replacement terms for the non-matching term from a list that is presented. The search is then performed on the modified query once the replacement term is chosen. Examiner respectfully asserts that this process of choosing

a replacement term is performed multiple times, with a modified search being performed each time for each of the one or more non-matching terms in the query.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include that search criteria for an item on a main item list provided in advance are generated for a topic in the search request for which no correspondence to an item in the database is found at said search criteria generation step to repeat the search in each of the main items and present the search results to the user, as taught by Ortega.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of enabling users of the spelling correction method of Ortega to select replacement terms that are more likely to be the terms intended for use by the user. The method increases the likelihood that the query result will contain items that are of interest to the user (Ortega, col. 2, lines 34-47).

22. Claims 19 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar, as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, in view of Ferrel, and further in view of US Publication Number 2002/0107735 A1 by Henkin et al (hereafter Henkin).

Referring to claims 19 and 63, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject as set forth above, but fails to teach that a database to be searched is a text base structured with tags, and if analysis of a search request shows that the query is about a word

without tag, the word is first used to perform a simple keyword search without tag and the results of the search are classified by tag added to words to be searched to present the results to the user.

However Ferrel teaches analogous art wherein a database to be searched is a text base structured with tags (refer to discussion of claim 15 above with regard to a structured text database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar to include a database to be searched that is a text base structured with tags, as taught by Ferrel.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of indexing database content (Ferrel, col. 3, lines 40-65; col.25, lines 46-50).

However, while Ferrel discloses the above mentioned limitation, Ferrel is silent as to the situation wherein if analysis of a search request shows that the query is about a word without tag, the word is first used to perform a simple keyword search without tag and the results of the search are classified by tag to present the results to the user.

Henkin teaches analogous art wherein if analysis of a search request shows that the query is about a word without tag, the word is first used to perform a simple keyword search without tag (para. 48). Henkin also teaches that the results of the search are classified by tag to present the results to the user (para. 93- 98; refer to Fig. 24d in reference to classification by categorical tag, namely, 'Apparel', 'Hawaiian Apparel', and 'Work Clothes and Uniform Apparel').

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar/Ferrel wherein if analysis of a search request shows that the query is about a word without tag, the word is first used to perform a simple keyword search without tag and the results of the search are classified by tag to present the results to the user, as taught by Henkin.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar/Ferrel per the above for the purpose of marking up textual object returned from the search and thus enabling any targeted word, phrases, etc. on any parsed web page to be converted to a link of any designation. In addition, this context-based technology proactively responds to textual content on any given web page, anywhere on the Internet, by marking up predefined keywords or phrases. In this way, target HTML content can be converted into links that direct users to specific web pages (Henkin, para. 48,50).

23. Claims 20, 21, 64, and 65, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar, as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, and further in view of US Patent Number 5,640,553 issued to Schultz.

Referring to claims 20, 21, 64, and 65, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject as set forth above, but fails to disclose:

- a text base database to be searched that is structured with tags in a main database;

- a provided list of items essential to a subject that is referenced to determine whether or not an essential item for one of items constituting a subject of the text to be entered is described in the text;
- searching a secondary database provided for the missing item by specifying a key item of the subject in the text to be entered and having the text complemented with a value obtained;
- replacing the list with a value specified for the tag to search through the main database.

However Schultz teaches in analogous art:

- a text base database to be searched that is structured with tags in a main database (col. 24, lines 43-46 and 50-52; 'image/text database', col. 29, lines 21-29 (Fig. 1, element 118); 'library database', col. 9, lines 15-18);
- a provided list of items essential to a subject that is referenced to determine whether or not an essential item for one of items constituting a subject of the text to be entered is described in the text ('index database', col. 4, lines 11-18; 'list of classifier words', col. 32, lines 25-29);
- searching a secondary database provided for the missing item by specifying a key item of the subject in the text to be entered and having the text complemented with a value obtained (different 'subject databases' can be searched, col. 32, lines 10-29);

- replacing the list with a value specified for the tag to search through the main database (col. 31, lines 44-55; col. 32, lines 10-22³).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar with the teachings to Schultz to include a text base database to be searched that is structured with tags in a main database, a provided list of items essential to a subject that is referenced to determine whether or not an essential item for one of items constituting a subject of the text to be entered is described in the text, searching a secondary database provided for the missing item by specifying a key item of the subject in the text to be entered and having the text complemented with a value obtained, and replacing the list with a value specified for the tag to search through the main database.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of enabling users to search particular subjects and to avoid searching through documents that are unlikely to be of interest to the user, which is done by the categorization of input documents (Schultz, col. 31, lines 44-54).

24. Claims 22 and 66, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar, as applied to claims 1 and 45 above, in view of Schultz, and further in view of Ortega.

³ The user can specify individual category or subject databases to search through within the image/text

Referring to claims 22 and 66, Anwar discloses all of the claimed subject as set forth above, but fails to disclose:

- a database to be searched that is a text base structured with tags;
- values for individual items are extracted and entered into individual databases at the same time when text is entered into the text database; and
- a group of spellings resembling each other is retrieved from each of the individual databases after the completion of the entry to enable a precise detection of variations in notation compared with that in a case where the entire text is searched.

However, Schultz teaches in analogous art:

- a database to be searched that is a text base structured with tags (refer to discussion of claim 21 above in reference to limitation 1); and
- values for individual items are extracted and entered into individual databases at the same time when text is entered into the text database (subject databases reside within the image/text database of the information retrieval system and are accessed when a query is input, col. 31, lines 44-55; col. 32, lines 10-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar with the teachings of Schultz to include a database to be searched that is a text base structured with tags and values for database.

individual items are extracted and entered into individual databases at the same time when text is entered into the text database.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar per the above for the purpose of avoiding searching through documents in a database that are unlikely to be of interest to a user, since a user can specifically search particular databases or categories (Shultz, col. 31, lines 44-52).

While Schultz mentions the fact that queries are spell-checked before being processed (col. 12, lines 36-45), Schultz remains silent as to the retrieval of a group of spellings resembling each other after completion of input of a search query.

However, Ortega teaches retrieval of a group of spellings resembling each other after completion of input of a search query ('associated related terms list' (Fig. 3, element 62), col. 4, line 61- col. 5, line 18; col. 7, lines 10-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Anwar/Schultz with the teachings to Ortega to include retrieval of a group of spellings resembling each other after completion of input of a search query.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Anwar/Schultz per the above for the purpose of correcting misspellings of terms that are do not appear in a dictionary thereby identifying terms that tend to be characterized by non-dictionary terms (Ortega, col. 7, lines 25-29).

Conclusion

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M Fernandes whose telephone number is (571) 272-4018. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMF
April 5, 2005



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER